

Application No.: 09/597,160

Docket No.: 21994-00007-US

REMARKS

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been carefully considered. In an effort to expedite the examination, a number of grammatical informalities have been corrected in the specification and the abstract in addition to those pointed out by the Examiner.

The claims have been carefully reviewed. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to clarify the informalities indicated by the Examiner so that further objection to these claims is not anticipated.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to clarify the nature of the first electronic watermark signal. New claims 5-8 have been added to emphasize apparatus and method (claim 8) relying upon a recording method wherein the first electronic watermark signal is recorded intermittently during every interval of a plurality of information units.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a), three references being cited. The following comments should highlight the patentable differences between the claimed invention and the cited prior art.

With respect to claims 1 and 4, the Examiner argues that the reference number 170 (BUFFER) in figure 1 of Nakano (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,233) is equivalent to memory means of the present invention. However, in the present invention, memory means store a first electronic watermark that is detected by detecting means (page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 4). In other words, the memory means stores an electronic watermark signal that is recorded in original contents data.

On the contrary, the BUFFER 170 of Nakano is a buffer that memorizes data, which is processed through the DCT (discrete cosine transform) method. Consequently, the Buffer 170 is not for memorizing an electronic watermark signal.

Further, the Examiner argues that the ELECTRONIC WATERMARK BURYING UNIT 130 in figure 1 of Nakano is equivalent to inserting means of the present invention. However, in the present invention, a second electronic watermark signal that has the

Application No.: 09/597,160

Docket No.: 21994-00007-US

same contents as that of the first electronic watermark signal, is inserted by the inserting means (page 10, lines 10-17).

On the other hand, Nakano fails to teach that the electronic watermark signal detected by the ELECTRONIC WATERMARK DETECTOR 180 has the same contents as that of the ELECTRONIC WATERMARK DATA 140.

According to claims 1 and 4 of the present invention, a first electronic watermark signal is scattered and recorded over a plurality of information units (e.g. a plurality of frames) of the original contents data (page 9, lines 17-21). In case of extracting only a part of the original contents data, the part of the original contents data contains only a part of the first electronic watermark signal (page 10, lines 18-28). In this case, the plurality of information units must be completely integrated, otherwise the first electronic watermark signal cannot be read out (page 9, lines 17-25). This is substantially equivalent to the condition when the first electronic watermark signal disappears.

Thus, the present invention inserts a second electronic watermark signal, having a content that is equivalent to that of the first electronic watermark signal into extracted contents data.

On the contrary, none of the references: Nakano, Wakasu (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,053) nor Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,378) teaches this.

According to claims 5 and 8 of the present invention, a first electronic watermark signal is recorded over a plurality of information units (e.g. a plurality of frames) of the original contents data (page 9, lines 17-21). In case of extracting only a part of the original contents data, the part of the original contents data excludes the first electronic watermark signal (page 10, lines 18-28). In this case, the first electronic watermark signal disappears as a result. The cited references fail to meet these limitations.

The Examiner further argues that Wakasu teaches extracting means for extracting a part of the contents data from the original contents data (figure 1, ref num 103). The extracting means of Wakasu extracts a part of the current image, that is, blocks of 8x8 pixels (col. 8, lines 31-36). However, Wakasu fails to teach that the extracted blocks

Application No.: 09/597,160

Docket No.: 21994-00007-US

contain a part of an electronic watermark signal or excludes the electronic watermark signal. As mentioned above, contents data extracted by the extracting means of the present invention contain a part of the first electronic watermark signal or exclude the first electronic watermark signal.

Consequently, the extracting means of Wakasu is completely different form extracting means of the present invention.

Accordingly, Nakano, Wakasu and Yoshida would not be reasonably combined by one of ordinary skill in the art to meet the claims.

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve to advance the prosecution of this application in any way, the undersigned attorney is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with this communication, including any extension fees, to CBLH Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Dated: November 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Morris Liss

Registration No.: 24,510
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant